

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, and 8-14 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,036,091 to Nguyen ("*Nguyen*") in view of U.S. Patent No 6,819,344 to Robbins ("*Robbins*"), U.S. Patent No. 5,745,717 to Vayda et al. ("*Vayda*"), and U.S. Patent No. 5,317,687 to Torres ("*Torres*").

By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 4, 5, 8, and 11-14. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 8-14 remain pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, and 8-14 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nguyen* in view of *Robbins*, *Vayda*, and *Torres*.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for displaying an electronic equipment input state on a menu screen, including "displaying a first ring . . . and primary icons . . . on the first ring," and "highlighting a first icon of the primary icons while also displaying a second icon of the primary icons, wherein the second icon is surrounded by a second ring that does not surround the first icon." Combinations of *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, *Vayda*, and *Torres* fail to teach or suggest at least the claimed "highlighting a first icon."

With respect to Figure 5, *Nguyen* discloses first menu 420 with selectable options 424. *Nguyen*, col. 7, lines 49-55. By selecting one of selectable options 424 on first menu 420, a second menu 520 can be displayed. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 55-58.

*Nguyen's* selecting one of selectable options 424, while also displaying other selectable options 424 does not constitute the claimed "highlighting a first icon of the primary icons while also displaying a second icon of the primary icons" at least because *Nguyen* does not teach or suggest "wherein the second icon is surrounded by a second

ring that does not surround the first icon,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Indeed, *Nguyen* is silent with respect to any “second ring” as claimed.

*Robbins* fails to cure any of the deficiencies of *Nguyen*. With respect to Figure 12, *Robbins* discloses wheel 352 around a portion of helical path 340. *Robbins*, col. 10, lines 30-32. However, *Robbins* does not “highlight” anything, much less “a first icon” such that “a second ring . . . does not surround the first icon,” as recited in claim 1.

*Vayda* and *Torres* fail to cure the deficiencies of *Nguyen* and *Robbins*, by also failing to teach or suggest “highlighting a first icon of the primary icons while also displaying a second icon of the primary icons, wherein the second icon is surrounded by a second ring that does not surround the first icon,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, combinations of *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, *Vayda*, and *Torres* fail to teach or suggest claim 1. Independent claim 5, while of different scope than claim 1, distinguishes over *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, *Vayda*, and *Torres* for reasons similar to claim 1. Claims 4 and 8-14 distinguish over *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, *Vayda*, and *Torres* at least due to their dependence from one of independent claims 1 or 5.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 1, 2009

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Fahd Hussein Patel  
Reg. No. 61,780  
(202) 408-6072